

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Commission, ) Application No. C-1628/NUSF  
on its own motion, seeking to )  
conduct an investigation into ) Progression Order No. 8  
intrastate access charge reform )  
and intrastate universal )  
service fund. ) Entered: October 14, 1999

BY THE COMMISSION:

O P I N I O N S     A N D     F I N D I N G S

On January 13, 1999, the Commission entered an order that envisioned each incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) submitting a transition plan for Commission approval. The order required that each transition plan detail any and all rate adjustments during the applicable transition period. Furthermore, the Commission established the residential target rate of \$17.50 and the single-line business service rate of \$27.50.

While the Commission made every effort to comprehensively address the issues surrounding the successful creation and administration of the Nebraska Universal Service Fund (NUSF), there still remain areas that need to be clarified. Therefore, the Commission proposes to seek comments on the following issues. Interested parties should comment on the appropriateness of these issues and list any additional areas that they feel the Commission should clarify in Docket No. C-1628. **The Commission is not seeking comment on the substance of these issues at this time.**

1. Are the basic local service benchmarks set by the Commission "minimum" price levels, meaning that companies raising basic local service prices above the benchmarks merely receive a lower universal service support amount or should companies raising basic local service prices above the benchmarks forfeit all universal service support?

2. Do implicit subsidies still exist in the rural ILEC access structure and price limits adopted by the Commission?

If a rural ILEC can comply with the access structure and price limits, should the company be required to raise its basic local service prices to the benchmarks and make corresponding revenue reductions in access charges?

If a rural ILEC's access structure and prices contain no implicit subsidies, should it be required to raise basic local service prices to the benchmarks?

3. What rural ILECs should be entitled to utilize the 1.25 factor for access rates and in what circumstances?

4. Given that rural ILEC access price limits are based on NECA interstate access rates, should the price limits be updated when NECA changes its interstate access rates?

5. Should rural ILEC company intrastate access prices be allowed to exceed the access price limits as a result of the RIC/TIC rate element being phased to other access elements?

6. How should non-rural exchanges be treated when purchased by a rural telephone company? How should rural exchanges be treated when purchased by a non-rural telephone company?

7. Should individual companies that are jointly owned or controlled by the same holding or parent company be considered as one company in terms of any de minimus exemption?

#### O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that interested parties file comments in this matter on or before December 2, 1999. Parties filing comments should file three paper copies and one electronic copy in WordPerfect 6.0 (or newer) format.

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 14th day of October, 1999.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

Chairman

ATTEST:

Executive Director

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.